STATE CAPITOL P.O. BOX 942849 SACRAMENTO, CA 94449-0060 (916) 319-2060 FAX (916) 319-2180

DISTRICT OFFICE 23955 E. GOLDEN SPHIKGS DRIVE DIAMOND BAR, CA 91765 (209) 80-8540 FAX (609) 960-6684

WEBSITE INVASSEMBIÇA GOV/nuff

July 25, 2007

Assembly California Aegislature



BOB HUFF REPUBLICAN CAUCUS CHAIR ASSEMBLYMAN, SIXTIETH DISTRICT COMMITTEES

EDUCATION
HEALTH
THANSPORTATION
BUOGET SUB. 5,
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
AND TRANSPORTATION

Bob Huff 07-5-6

Ms. Mary Nichols, Chair California Air Resources Board P.O. Box 2815 1001 I Street Sacramento, CA 95812

Re: Adoption of In Use Off-Road Diesel Regulations

Dear Ms. Nichols:

I have written this letter to express my concern for California Air Resources Board's (CARB) attempt to impose a regulation on off-road diesel construction equipment. I am deeply concerned about the financial longevity of construction companies that must undergo dramatic alterations to successfully comply with the time-sensitive standards CARB wishes to implement.

I agree with CARB's ambition to improve California's air quality along with the health and well being of the state's population. It should be a top priority. However, I also believe in the economic well being of the construction industry which can be negatively affected by such regulations. Therefore, it is beneficial that other alternatives be considered before pursuing in a direction that may have unintended economic consequences.

Despite my full support for the goals of the proposed CARB regulation, in its current form it is simply not viable for several key reasons. The difference in CARB's projected cost estimate of \$3 billion and that of the construction industry's projected \$13 billion raises great concern. Such discrepancies in cost estimates must indicate further evaluation of the regulations' ultimate fiscal effect on the construction industry.

I believe it is important to the health of California to reduce the emissions of air pollutants but the process must come in a timely matter. According to CARB's staff report on the proposed regulation, "The first fleet average compliance dates would be March 1, 2010 for large fleets, March 1, 2013 for medium fleets, and March 1, 2015 for small fleets." This timeline is both economically and technologically implausible. The demands to meet such hasty deadlines would not only put financial strain on the

construction industry but substantially increase the cost of rebuilding efforts throughout California.

The good news is that a coalition of industry, infrastructure and Labor stakeholders has developed an alternative plan that will allow CARB to reach its goals while keeping California's rebuilding efforts and the state's economy moving forward. I am writing today to express my support for this plan and to ask you and the entire Board to adopt it.

Given the multi-billon dollar cost of this regulation, contractors should at least be given the opportunity to comply in the most reasonable and flexible manner possible. This alternative is the best way to achieve the desired emission reductions and minimize the cost to achieve the goal. I ask you and your fellow Board members to carefully consider this compelling alternative that will deliver Californians the clean air they deserve and the infrastructure projects they have so rightfully demanded last November.

Sincerely,

Bob Huff Assemblyman, 60th District

BH: jlj